

REMARKSClaim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Blume (US 2004/0056900 A1) (“Blume”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited reference fails to anticipate Applicant’s invention as claimed in claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30.

The Examiner has responded to Applicant’s argument as set forth in the response mailed to the Examiner on May 24, 2007 by asserting that Blume discloses “exemplary filtering operations may include techniques such as lowering spatial resolution, reducing color saturation, reducing contrast, reducing level-of-details, and using lower resolution texture maps indicates that a reduction in the overall size of the image data residing in the window.” (Blume page 3, paragraph 46 and page 4, paragraph 57) The Examiner specifically mentions that Blume’s statement of “a reduction of the overall size of the image data” is equal to *compression*, based on using one or more of the above listed filtering operations/techniques. If they are related to compression, every technique referenced in Blume would be limited to *lossy compression*

These modifications that are mentioned will inherently reduce the information related to the picture, which will reduce the quality of the image. This is not similar to *lossless compression*. Lowering the spatial resolution, reducing the level of detail, using lower resolution texture maps, etc... all of these items matter-of-factly reduce the

information associated with the picture, which is specifically lossy compression. By operating on an image using these techniques, the image loses information and recreating the original image is impossible.

Amended claim 1 of Applicant's presently claimed invention claims:

“A method, comprising assigning a priority level to a window in a windows-based environment, and compressing the image data residing in the window if the priority level of the window falls below a predetermined threshold priority level, *wherein the type of compression used is lossless.*” (Claim 1)(Emphasis added)

Although the term “lossless” is not specifically used in Applicant's specification, this is something that is inherent to Applicant's presently claimed invention. The idea behind the invention is to compress image data on windows that are not in focus and when they return to focus they are decompressed to the initial image. Specifically, in paragraph [0012] of Applicant's specification, Applicant states: “When the image data is to be displayed the de-compressor pulls the image data information from the compressed window memory and decompresses the data into a viewable image which is delivered to the rendering engine to compose the data into a desktop image and sent to the display.”

To utilize lossy compression in this scheme would be to essentially break the scheme. For example, it is quite possible that a person could switch multiple times between two windows. If lossy compression were utilized, each time the window is defocused, the compression algorithm would lose information regarding the image data in the window. The more compression-decompression cycles that happen to the window, the more severe the degradation of the image within the window. Until, eventually, the

window would be completely unintelligible and useless. Thus, a lossless compression algorithm is mandatory for this scheme to be successful.

Since the method in Blume is limited specifically to lossy compression techniques, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume does not anticipate claim 1 of the presently claimed invention.

In regard to independent claims 14 and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume does not teach Applicant's invention at least for the same reasons as independent claim 1.

Claims 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 14, and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not anticipate claims 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23-27, 29, and 30.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Blume, in view of Hiroi (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,846) ("Hiroi"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 31.

Claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 31 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 14, and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume and Hiroi, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 31.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of pending claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 31.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Blume, in view of Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,415 B1) ("Rao"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 10 and 28.

Claims 10 and 28 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1 and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume and Rao, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 10 and 28.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of pending claims 10 and 28.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-0221. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 22, 2007

/Derek J. Reynolds/

Derek J. Reynolds

Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358